

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to an Official Action that was issued in this case on March 28, 2005 and accompanies a Request for Continued Examination. In the Action, claims 7, 8, and 11 through 20 were finally rejected, as follows:

- Claims 7, 8, and 11 through 16 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,563 to Mosinskis *et al.*
- Claims 17 through 20 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,563 to Mosinskis *et al.* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,441,594 to Connell *et al.*

The final rejection of claims 7, 8, and 11 through 20 were appealed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. In its decision, dated August 15, 2006, the Board upheld the final rejection of the claims.

Responsive to the Action, therefore, claims 7, 8, and 11 through 20 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 7, 8, and 11 through 16

Claims 7, 8, and 11 through 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,563 to Mosinskis *et al.* (hereinafter "Mosinskis").

Amended claim 7 recites an article comprising:

7. An apparatus comprising:
a bandgap reference voltage generator having an output terminal;
an operational amplifier having a positive input terminal, a negative input terminal, and an output terminal, wherein the negative input terminal of said operational amplifier is electrically connected directly to the output terminal of said bandgap reference voltage generator without intervening elements;
a transistor having a gate, a source, and a drain, wherein the gate of said transistor is electrically connected directly to the output of said operational amplifier without intervening elements, and wherein the drain of said transistor is electrically connected directly to the positive input terminal of said operational amplifier without intervening elements;
a voltage divider having a input terminal, an output terminal, and a common terminal, wherein said input terminal of said voltage divider is electrically connected directly to the positive input terminal of said operational amplifier without intervening elements;
a startup network having a first positive supply terminal and an output terminal, wherein said output terminal of said startup network is electrically connected directly to said input terminal of said voltage divider without intervening elements; and
a self-biasing network having a second positive supply terminal, a common terminal, and an output terminal, wherein said second positive supply terminal of said self-biasing network is electrically connected **directly** to said output terminal of said startup network **without intervening elements**, and wherein said common terminal of said self-biasing network is electrically connected directly to said common terminal of said voltage divider without intervening elements.

(Emphasis supplied)

Nowhere does Mosinskis teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what amended claim 7 recites – namely that **the positive supply terminal of the self-biasing network is electrically connected directly to the output terminal of the startup network without intervening elements**.

All claims in the instant application, including claim 7, have been amended to replace the term “electrically connected to ...” with the term “electrically connected directly to ... without intervening elements” This change provides a distinction between: (1) two points in a circuit that are electrically connected without any intervening elements (*i.e.*, shorted, so as to be at the same potential for substantially any current); and (2) two points in a circuit that are electrically connected via an intervening element, such as a resistor.

For this reason, claim 7, as amended, is allowable over Mosinskis. Due to their dependence on claim 7, claims 8 and 11 through 16 are likewise allowable. The Office is

therefore requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 7, 8, and 11 through 16 over Mosinskis.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 17 through 20

Claims 17 through 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mosinskis in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,441,594 to Connell, *et al* (hereinafter "Connell").

Claims 17 through 20, as amended, are dependent upon claim 7, as amended. In view of these amendments, Connell does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosure of Mosinskis, vis-à-vis the invention recited in claim 7. And, as a consequence, claims 17 through 20 are allowable. The Office is therefore requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 7, 8, and 11 through 20 now presented for examination are in condition for allowance. As a consequence, the Examiner is requested to allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

Respectfully,

By **/Jason Paul DeMont/**

Jason Paul DeMont

Reg. No. 35793

Attorney for Applicants

732-578-0103 x11

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America